

stretching from his eye all the way down to his chin. His teeth were smashed, and his jaw was brutally dashed in half. The incident made national news.

Just 2 years later, Tracy Stone-Manning rented a typewriter to disguise her identity. She then typed and sent a letter to the U.S. Forest Service on behalf of an ecoterrorist group. She conspired to spike trees with spikes just like this one—hundreds and hundreds of pounds of spikes just like this one. In so doing, endangered the lives of foresters, of loggers, and of firefighters. She ended the letter with the following words:

You bastards go in there anyway and a lot of people could get hurt.

Unfortunately, it wasn't until after her nomination hearing that we learned of her work with the ecoterrorist organization EarthFirst!. It wasn't until after her hearing that we learned that she had been issued a target letter by a Federal grand jury and had hired an attorney to negotiate an immunity deal prior to testifying in the tree-spiking case.

It wasn't until after her hearing that we read her words in a newspaper saying that she "could have been charged with conspiracy were it not for her agreement with the U.S. attorney." It wasn't until after her hearing that we learned that she was compelled by that same Federal grand jury to submit fingerprints, writing samples, and hair samples.

Now, beyond her involvement with the ecoterrorist group, since her hearing, we learned of public statements she made just months ago calling for homes to burn in forest fires. We learned of statements she made saying grazing is destroying the West and calling for population control measures and even labeling children as environmental hazards.

After all of this, a White House official called her nomination a "massive vetting failure." It was that, but it is so much worse than that. She was and is a radical. She supported a criminal conspiracy to engage in ecoterrorism.

Our committee asked her if she had ever been the subject of a criminal investigation. She, in a sworn statement, lied. Our committee never had the opportunity to ask her about these shameful acts. Her past actions, her positions, her statements, and her goals would each, individually, disqualify her from service. But combined, they make her a, frankly, offensive candidate to the countless people in Utah and throughout the West and beyond who rely on Bureau of Land Management cooperation for their livelihoods and for their way of life.

Now, inexplicably, President Biden has not withdrawn this nomination, though Ms. Stone-Manning has seemingly gone into hiding. She has left unanswered dozens of questions formally posed to her by me and by my colleagues. If confirmed, she will lack the credibility with constituents through-

out the Nation that she would otherwise need to perform this job. She just won't have it. And any accomplishments made by the Biden administration to steward our lands will be overshadowed by her specter of deceit.

The Bureau of Land Management controls 42 percent of the land in Utah. In fact, the BLM controls more land in Utah than Utahns do—a lot more.

So I speak for a lot of people back home today, people who are insulted by President Biden's nomination of Tracy Stone-Manning to run the Bureau of Land Management. Her confirmation would be bad for Utah, bad for the Bureau of Land Management, and bad for honesty and accountability in government.

Needless to say, she will not receive my vote. It defies logic, reason, and the greatest traditions of this body to think that we would confirm her today. I urge my colleagues to reject this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

ROUTE 91 HARVEST FESTIVAL SHOOTING ANNIVERSARY

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the memories of the lives that were lost in Las Vegas on October 1, 2017. Four years ago tomorrow, the Las Vegas community experienced tragedy on an unprecedented scale.

Tens of thousands of people gathered that night for a country music festival. They were there to have fun, to dance, and to enjoy a concert with family and friends. That night, the fun quickly turned to terror when gunfire erupted, taking 60 innocent souls and injuring hundreds and hundreds more. In just 10 minutes—10 minutes—dozens of lives were cut short and so many more were forever changed.

These victims were friends and family, brothers and sisters, parents and children, and that night, they were taken from us. The people that survived and the loved ones that didn't are still grieving, still feeling that loss with every passing holiday, every passing birthday, every single day their lives are forever changed.

Nevada will always feel that loss too. This was the worst mass shooting in American history, and it happened in our State.

But I know our community is strong. We are resilient, and in our darkest hour—and in the days and weeks and months and now even years after—we remain united. We remain Vegas Strong.

We are united in our grief for those we lost but also in our admiration for those who helped save lives and support others that night: heroic law enforcement officers and first responders, everyday citizens who ran toward the danger—they ran toward the danger to help others—and countless Nevadans who waited in line to donate blood and help people who were displaced in the chaotic aftermath of the shooting.

As we reflect on the 4 years since this horrific event, I stand here today—I

stand here today to honor the heroes who put themselves in harm's way to save others. I stand here today to honor those who were injured physically, psychologically, and emotionally, especially those who are still fighting to recover. Know that we are with you now and always. And I stand here today to honor those who lost their lives. They will never ever be forgotten. May their memories be a blessing. And in their memory, we are resilient. In their honor, we are strong. We are Vegas Strong.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, first of all, I ask permission to use an item to demonstrate in the speech that I am going to give, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF TRACY STONE-MANNING

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, fellow Senators, and the American public, I rise today to underscore a travesty that is about to take place here in about an hour on the floor of the U.S. Senate. I am talking about the BLM matter, the Bureau of Land Management matter, the nominee the President of the United States has made to run the Bureau of Land Management as the Director of the Bureau of Land Management. That person is Tracy Stone-Manning.

I think the facts have pretty well been laid out already in the media. At the same time, there is tremendous outrage, I can tell you, amongst not only BLM employees but among the people who earn their living and recreate on the millions of acres of BLM. It is incredible, it is astonishing, and it is an embarrassment for this administration to nominate a person who is an ecoterrorist and a person who has perjured themselves before the committee that she appeared before on her confirmation and, in addition to that, has espoused a "let it burn" philosophy for people's homes that she will take an oath to defend if she becomes head of the BLM, which I believe she is going to before the Sun goes down today.

It is amazing to me that the administration would put this person in this position. There are 330 million people in America. Almost every single one of those people, including some high school kids, could do this substantially better than she could and would not tarnish the name of the BLM, which is going to happen when she is confirmed as the Director of the BLM.

So what did she do? Well, she engaged in acts of ecoterrorism. She engaged in a conspiracy to kill other people. She engaged in acts with Earth First! that put her squarely in the target of the U.S. Government, along with her cohorts with whom she lived in a house in Montana at the time. But she got off the hook. She didn't get prosecuted because she turned on the others and turned state's evidence. She hired an attorney, and that attorney

negotiated with the U.S. attorney there, and she wound up testifying against the others, so she wasn't convicted. Nonetheless, she was as deeply involved in this as they were.

Let me read for you a letter that she wrote. She admits to writing this letter:

To whom it may concern, this letter is being sent to notify you that the Post Office Sale in Idaho has been spiked heavily.

The post office sale was a Forest Service sale of standing timber in the Clearwater National Forest in Idaho. She writes this letter regarding that.

The reasoning for this action is that this piece of land is very special to the earth. It is home to the Elk, Deer, Mountain Lions, Birds, and especially the Trees.

She is absolutely correct on that.

The next paragraph describes what she did.

The project required that eleven of us—

Most of whom lived in that house in Montana—

spend nine days in God awful weather conditions spiking trees. We unloaded a total of five hundred pounds of spikes measuring 8 to 10 inches in length.

For people who don't understand what spiking trees is, and most people in America wouldn't, you think, how could it be harmful in going out and putting a spike in a tree?

This is a spike. It is not a particularly large one, but it doesn't take a particularly large one. What they do is they drive this item into a tree. They drive it in far enough that you can't see it. It then stands there until some unsuspecting logger comes along and cuts the tree down. That logger could be injured, but it is unlikely they will be, but they could be because of the hidden spike that was in the tree.

The tree is then, after it is cut down, cut into length—usually 16 foot—put onto a truck, and hauled to the mill. Once it gets to the mill, it is put in a millpond. It is then pushed eventually into the mill, and when it enters the mill, it goes on a carriage, and the carriage carries it to a saw. The saw may move back and forth, cutting the wood that is on this log in the carriage, or more likely, the carriage itself will move against the moving saw.

There are a couple kinds of saws. One is a circular saw. It could be 5 feet. Depending on the size of the mill, it could be 5 feet, 6 feet, 10 feet. But in today's world, more often than not, it is a bandsaw. A bandsaw is a piece of metal stripping that is a quarter-inch thick or so and probably a couple inches wide with teeth, and it circulates in the mill between the first floor, the second floor, even the third floor. As the carriage hits it, it then saws the log into boards.

All is well unless there is one of these in the log. What happens when that saw hits this item in the log? In the best description I can give you, it is much like a hand grenade going off, except that there is no fire explosion, but there is just as much shrapnel that goes out of this at a speed that is very,

very fast because all of the moving parts are moving very fast. And what does it do? It kills, and it injures log workers who are right there on the floor.

These are innocent people. They are people who are working to make a living for themselves, for their families, for their children. They are people who go to work in the morning and do not come home because someone knowingly, intentionally, maliciously, with a black and an abandoned heart, stuck one of these in the tree. That is the only reason you put one of these in a tree, is to kill and maim fellow human beings who are absolutely innocent and who have done nothing wrong.

She was involved in this. This person whom the administration wants to run the Bureau of Land Management, which manages millions of acres, the largest tracts of land in the United States of America—they want to put this woman in charge of this Agency. They sell timber all the time. She will be in charge of that. There is no need for this woman to be in charge of this Agency. There are plenty of people who could do this.

Today, in the Clearwater National Forest, those trees are still there. Some of them will be there for 100 or more years. It is very possible one of these is going to kill somebody working in one of the mills at some point in time after all of us are dead and gone.

They will ask at that time: How did this happen?

They will say: Well, a woman who eventually became head of the BLM was involved in putting these spikes in these trees here.

People will shake their heads and say: What were those people thinking? That is shameful. It is despicable.

Yet that is what is about to happen here.

Now, that was a while ago that this happened, but what has happened recently?

She will be in charge of firefighting. Firefighting is absolutely critical on public lands in the West. We need it on Forest Service land; we need it on Bureau of Land Management land. But, like I said, she has embraced the idea that letting fires burn and burning down the houses that are in the interface zones is perfectly fine.

How do we know this? It is in writing. It is absolutely in writing. There was an article written, fortuitously, by her husband in 2018 but which she embraced on September 15, 2020, in a tweet, and I will get to the tweet in a minute. But this is the view that her husband takes of what should happen to houses—perfectly innocent people's houses—that are built near public lands. The idea is, let it burn.

He says:

But the federal government then needs to make fighting wildfires—a social process—subject to a social contract. Perhaps the feds should commit themselves to refusing to send in the troops to any county that has not taken such measures. Perhaps the solu-

tion to houses in the interface is to let them burn.

He says:

There's a rude and satisfying justice in burning down the house of someone who builds in the forest.

She embraced this. Just a little over a year ago, she put out a tweet and said:

Not a bad time to revisit this piece from my husband, Richard Manning, from two years ago. [This is a] clarion call.

"Let them burn," she says; a clarion call to let people's homes burn.

She put that out on September 15, 2020, just a little over a year ago. This is the person we are going to confirm to fight fires and protect people's homes in the West.

All of us in the West live relatively close to the interface zones, and many people, millions of people, live in the interface zones. She is saying it is a clarion call to let them burn, and, indeed, they will get a rude and satisfying justice in burning down the houses that were built in the interface zone.

You can't make this stuff up. If someone wrote a book about this, someone would toss it and say: That is too ridiculous. This could never happen.

This is the woman this U.S. Senate is going to confirm on a straight party-line vote in about an hour here.

So she comes before the committee, and although we didn't have all of the facts at the time, as has been alluded to by my colleagues here, we were aware that she had attachments to ecoterrorist groups. So some questions were put to her, and as always happens before the committee, they are required to be signed under oath, which she did, and she was asked whether or not she had ever been arrested or charged or been the target of an investigation involving spiking. She says—now under oath after solemnly swearing to tell the truth—"No, I have never been arrested or charged, and to my knowledge, I have never been the target of such an investigation."

She hired an attorney to negotiate with the U.S. attorney because she was a target of the investigation, had received a target letter, and had been told she was a target of that.

What are we doing here? How in the world can somebody come before a committee, take an oath that they would tell the truth, and then flat lie?

She was also asked: Did you have personal knowledge of—did you have personal knowledge of—participate in, or in any way, directly or indirectly, support activities associated with the spiking of trees in Idaho's Clearwater National Forest on March 29, 1989?

We read the letter she wrote where she admitted that she was involved in that.

Her answer to that: "I had no involvement in the spiking of trees." Under oath, she said that. We know otherwise.

She said, "Eleven of us [spent] nine days in God awful weather conditions

spiking trees," and she under oath says, "No."

Next question: Did you have personal knowledge of, participate in, or in any way, directly or indirectly, support activities associated with the spiking of trees in any forest during your lifetime?

Answer: "No."

We know better. She admitted to signing this letter where she fessed up to it.

Well, look, I know I am not going to talk the Democrats out of confirming her. I can tell you that this is a shameful, shameful thing for the administration to do. It is a shameful thing for my friends in the majority to confirm her.

What I can tell you is, when she comes before the committee that we sit on, where we have oversight of the BLM—and we have the Director in regularly because we have oversight responsibility—how will we believe one word she says when she has already perjured herself?

This is wrong. It is a shameful moment for this administration. I can tell you the employees of the Bureau of Land Management are going to have a very difficult time working under a person who is an ecoterrorist and who is a perjurer. She should not be confirmed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAINE). The Senator from Wyoming.

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, I rise today to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Idaho and the gentleman from Utah, who just spoke about one of the most egregious nominations to ever receive a vote on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

I am speaking of President Biden's nomination of Tracy Stone-Manning to be Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

I have been here in Washington, DC, for close to a decade now, and I know that oftentimes it feels there are few things that unite us as Democrats and Republicans. I would have hoped that just one of those things that would have united us would be opposition to ecoterrorism; and yet, in about an hour, the Senate will be voting to confirm a known ecoterrorist collaborator to lead one of the most consequential land management agencies.

I am flabbergasted. I am aghast. I am horrified. This is a solemn, bad day for land management in the United States.

Here we are, \$28 trillion-plus in debt—28 trillion-plus in debt. Inflation is threatening every single American. We have a global pandemic, a major crisis at our southern border, a massive government expansion, and debt ceiling debate, and Senate Democrats want to put an ecoterrorist collaborator to manage one of the biggest land management agencies in the United States.

The Bureau of Land Management administers about 245 million acres of land. It manages 18.4 million acres of public land surface in my State and

nearly 43 million acres of Federal mineral estate in my home State of Wyoming.

As is required by law, the Bureau of Land Management operates under a multiple-use mandate that balances recreation needs, energy development, grazing, conservation, mining, wildlife habitat, and more. Leading this Agency requires someone who is balanced and committed to supporting this multiple-use mandate. It is the law that governs the Bureau of Land Management.

Do we have that in Ms. Stone-Manning?

As reported by the Washington Post, of all places, Ms. Stone-Manning was a spokeswoman for Earth First!, the group responsible for the ecoterrorist tree spiking spoken of by Mr. RISCH and Mr. LEE moments ago in Idaho's Clearwater National Forests.

So what is the motto for the group for which Ms. Stone-Manning served as a mouthpiece?

Here it is: "No compromise in the defense of Mother Earth."

No compromise. None. And yet we are supposed to trust that Ms. Stone-Manning will compromise on the inevitable conflicts that will come before her as BLM Director, the requirement that she balance the interests on use of BLM land?

For President Biden and my Senate colleagues across the aisle, do you really want your names associated with a "no compromise" mouthpiece of a convicted ecoterrorist organization; someone who lied under oath to the Energy and Natural Resources Committee?

In her testimony, she lied under oath. Someone who has advocated for population control as a means to save the environment; someone who has written that grazing is "destroying the West."

Now, pair that remark with what you just heard from Senator RISCH. Senator RISCH says: She and her husband want those houses in the interface with the forest to burn.

What prevents them from burning?

It is grazing. Grazing done right helps keep the forest floor and the grasses from igniting conflagrations. Grazing is good for the West, yet she has written that grazing destroys the West. Grazing is one of the elements of multiple use.

Does that mean that she is going to use her position to try to eliminate grazing in the West?

That would add to catastrophic fires. That would add to carbon emissions from these monster fires that we are having.

Management requires land management. That is why it is called the Bureau of Land Management. It is not the bureau of land let it be, let it burn, let it rot, let it be ignored. It is the Bureau of Land Management, with a multiple-use mandate.

Ms. Manning is wholly unqualified to serve in this position—absolutely unqualified.

I urge President Biden to withdraw her nomination before 7:00 tonight, and for Senate Democrats to join us in saying no to this nominee. This nominee is an insult to the American West.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to use a prop on the Senate floor, a tree spike.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, you see some of my colleagues are down here. We are a little bit fired up. Right? And this is not some kind of partisan game. We are fired up for a reason—that the U.S. Senate is getting ready to confirm a nominee who has no business being even considered on the Senate floor. No business being considered on the Senate floor.

And with all due respect to my colleague from Montana, this isn't—what did he say—attacks against somebody. These are facts that we are going to talk about. These are facts—someone who is still continuing to not even tell the truth about her past as a violent ecoterrorist.

Now, look, we know this administration has put forth far-left individuals. I am going to talk about a few. But to put forward a far-left, violent nominee—I think we all should recognize—is kind of a bridge too far for the U.S. Senate.

But that is happening right now, and I am really hopeful that at least some of my Democratic colleagues, at the last minute, will go: Maybe we shouldn't do this. Maybe we shouldn't set this standard.

So I have been on the floor a number of times talking about Tracy Stone-Manning's nomination. It is actually the first time in my Senate career that I asked the President to withdraw a nominee, and for good reasons—because of all the things you have heard from my colleagues from Wyoming, Idaho; colleagues from mostly Western States.

And I am going to ask my Democratic colleagues from Western States: Do you really want to set this precedent? How are you going to go home and tell people who harvest timber legally for a living that you were good to go with this; good to go with someone who put hundreds of these kinds of tree spikes in trees for people—our fellow Americans—to get hurt?

But that is what we are seeing right here.

You know, I think that maybe the Biden administration, after I and many others requested that they withdraw this nominee, that maybe they thought: Well, look. With all the noise going on around here—a reckless \$3½ trillion tax-and-spend extravaganza, the botched Afghanistan withdrawal, the crisis on the southern border, inflation going through the roof, the price at the pump hurting working families in my State and those across America,

the shutdown of the energy sector unilaterally and then going begging Russia and Iran for more oil that they can import to the United States—I mean, you can't make this stuff up.

But I think the Biden administration thought, with all this chaos that they are creating, maybe nobody will notice Tracy Stone-Manning's confirmation process and vote.

Well, they are wrong. As you see here, there are some really strong feelings about this nominee—a past ecoterrorist; a member of Earth First!, an extreme group that performed violent acts as part of their platform for getting attention in America.

In fact, she is so extreme that the Director of BLM from the Obama-Biden administration, Bob Abbey, made a statement saying that if her violent ecoterrorist past activities were true—and they were. They were. I am going to talk about them. Senator RISCH has already talked about them; Senator BARRASSO has; Senator LUMMIS has—if these were true, then President Obama's BLM Director said she does not deserve the job.

So this isn't just Republicans. This is the former Democrat Director of the Agency that we are going to vote on that she wants to lead.

So before I talk a little bit more about her—and I know we have had a number of Senators do it—I want to make another point.

The reason I have been down here so much, focused on this nominee, is that BLM to some states—heck, if you live in Connecticut, probably nobody knows what that is. But the Bureau of Land Management in my State is one of the most powerful Federal Agencies there is in the great State of Alaska.

The Alaska BLM manages more surface and subsurface acres in my State than in any other State in the country, by far.

The BLM Director in Alaska is our landlord, and I don't want an ecoterrorist as my State's landlord, and neither do my constituents.

Let me give you some numbers. The BLM manager in Alaska manages over 70 million surface acres of land and 220 million subsurface acres of land in Alaska.

A little context: That is the equivalent land of about one-fifth of the entire lower 48. Do you see why this is really important to me and my constituents? Most States can't even comprehend land that size. One-fifth of the lower 48 of the United States of America is about the amount of land BLM manages just in my State. This is a huge amount of land, and, of course, by definition, a huge amount of power that this Federal Agency has over the people I am privileged to represent—their work, their jobs, their hunting activities, their subsistence activities. And that is why I have been down here talking about this nominee.

I know to some in East Coast States—forget it. We don't know who she is. No power. She doesn't have any

power over New Jersey or some of these other small States on the East Coast.

But in my State, massive power, and it is imperative that the Director of this Agency, the Bureau of Land Management, with so much power and so much control over the future of Alaska and its economic opportunity for working families, that the manager of BLM be trustworthy, be honest, be fair-minded, beyond reproach, and certainly not someone who was involved in ecoterrorism earlier in their career.

Is that too much to ask, my colleagues in the Senate?

What we know about Tracy Stone-Manning is, she is none of these things. She hasn't been trustworthy with the Senate, fair-minded.

Well, let's go back to a little bit of her background because people need to know this. People need to know this. My colleagues have already done a good job, but I hope the American people are watching this. She was not only a member of Earth First!, a radical far-left group that has engaged repeatedly in what is defined as ecoterrorism, she, herself, was complicit in putting metal spikes—see this—big, thick, metal spikes, by the hundreds, in trees that were meant either to hurt or gravely injure American citizens who were legally harvesting trees.

We are OK with that, Senate Democrats? We are OK with that? Americans who were cutting down trees legally as part of their job to help their economy, to help their family, who were putting trees in saw mills legally. All the while, she and her buddies—comrades, I call them—were acting illegally, putting these spikes, by the hundreds, in trees.

This was a common technique—tree spiking is what it is called—developed by ecoterrorists in the 1980s and early nineties. Now, Ms. Manning's group, Earth First!, began in the 1980s by disaffected environmentalists who thought their movement wasn't radical enough: "So how can we get more attention? Let's perpetrate violence against fellow Americans." That is how they could get more attention. Their slogan was "No compromise in the defense of Mother Earth." In their view, "no compromise" meant destroying property, putting steel spikes in trees that could kill someone who harvested a tree. And they celebrated and even encouraged such actions. The group even put out a manual detailing tree spiking and instructions on how to do other sabotage activities: cutting down power lines, flattening tires, burning machinery—all directed at those who were trying to legally harvest trees.

David Foreman, the founder of Earth First!, described all these activities as "fun." "This is where [you] can have fun."

Let me talk a little bit about "fun." I have an article from the Washington Post during that time. They were talking about a tree-spiking incident, and I am going to quote from it:

George Alexander, a third-generation mill worker, was just starting his shift at the Louisiana-Pacific lumber mill in Cloverdale, Calif., when the log that would alter his life rolled down his conveyor belt toward a high-speed saw.

Now, we have some of these saws in these mills in Alaska—not nearly as many as we used to have. They are huge. They are giant. They are the size of people. They spin at incredibly fast speeds with huge teeth. They are dangerous to work with normally. But when you put a steel spike in a tree that is going through a fastly spinning saw, you can imagine the explosion and the violence.

I will continue the article:

It was May 1987, and Alexander was 23 [years old]. His job was to split logs. He was nearly three feet away when the log [he was working on] hit his saw and the [giant] saw exploded. One half of the blade [struck] . . . the log.

It exploded when it hit one of these.

The other half hit Alexander in the [forehead, with the giant saw] tearing through his safety helmet . . . [tearing through his face shield. His face was slashed from eye to chin. His teeth were smashed and his jaw was cut in half.

Good job, Earth First!—a fellow American, trying to kill a fellow American. These were the kind of activities that Tracy Stone-Manning once conspired in.

I wonder if that disturbs anybody?

I was up at our fish camp on the Yukon River this summer over the Fourth of July clearing some brush, trees, working a chain saw—a smaller chain saw—and I literally was thinking, "Boy, I wonder what would happen if my chain saw hit one of these?"

It wouldn't have been good. So I think if you are not disturbed by this, you really should be.

So I know that some of my colleagues have already read the letter on the floor that she wrote, a profane, anonymous letter from this member of Earth First!, about the 500 pounds of tree spikes—500 pounds—hammered into trees in Idaho.

She rewrote the letter on a rented typewriter because, she later told a reporter, her fingerprints were all over it. So she didn't want to be caught. So, obviously, she knew she was engaging in criminal activity. She didn't just handwrite it; she typed it and then sent it to the FBI. Now, I know some of my colleagues have already read it. I am just going to notice a couple of highlights:

This letter is being sent to notify you that the Post Office Sale in [the great State of] Idaho has been spiked heavily. . . .

The project required that eleven of us spend nine days in God awful weather conditions spiking trees. We unloaded a total of 500 pounds of spikes measuring 8 to 10 inches in length. . . .

Five hundred pounds of these. That is a lot of spikes.

The majority of trees were spiked within the first ten feet, but many, many others were spiked as high as a hundred and fifty feet.

Again, why would they go that high? That is not where you are going to cut

it down. So when it goes to the mill, you injure and kill the mill workers.

She goes on further.

Mr. President, I don't know if I am allowed to swear, but you can call me out if I am not supposed to:

P.S. You bastards go in there anyway and a lot of people could get hurt.

That is real nice.

Now, she kept quiet for many years on what she did. She later received immunity for her part in this tree spiking when prosecutors went after other members of Earth First!, and she testified about it. But in her narrative, she has always tried to portray herself as a victim.

She wasn't a victim.

The investigator of this disputes that characterization dramatically. The U.S. Forest Service Special Agent Michael Merkley described her as vulgar, antagonistic, and extremely anti-government. She was uncooperative.

It was also clear that only after she knew she was going to get in trouble that she began to cooperate. "Let me be clear," Special Agent Merkley said recently, "Ms. Stone-Manning only came forward after her attorney struck the immunity deal, and not before she was caught."

In testimony to the Senate, she claimed that tree spiking was alleged.

It wasn't alleged.

And that it was never investigated.

That is not true. We know that is not true.

So that was recent.

So it is not just the tree spiking. She hasn't been honest, but she is still clearly a radical.

Let me give you another example. Her husband wrote an article for Harper's Magazine—Senator RISCH already talked about this—in 2018, claiming wildfires were a political issue and that such an issue should be solved by letting houses in forests burn.

Think about that.

Perhaps the solution to houses in the interface is to let them burn.

Those are his exact words. Now, look, that is her husband. We can't blame her for her husband's radical views.

But here is what she did. She weighed in herself in 2020—last year—retweeting the article and basically endorsing his views. Here is what she said:

Not a bad time to revisit this piece from my husband, Richard Manning, from two years ago. Clarion call . . . [on climate action].

So think about that.

So I was in charge of our lands in Alaska. We worked—including fighting wildfires—we worked really closely with the Federal Government, the State of Alaska, Federal officials, on fighting our wildfires. We have big wildfires in Alaska, always have had them, always will have them. Never ever, ever, in any time I was involved in issues relating to fighting wildfires, have I heard a State official or Federal official say, "Hey, if there is a fire near a bunch of homes, let them burn."

But do you see the problem? She is going to be in charge of that in Alaska.

"Let them burn."

You know what our Federal firefighters do? They save structures. They save houses. They are very heroic.

"Let them burn," she said last year.

In a nutshell, this is potentially, if we don't stop this vote tonight, the new head of the BLM. She was a member of an ecoterrorist group who had a goal to actually threaten to hurt or actually hurt American citizens, hard-working Americans doing something legal. She has clearly been dishonest recently.

With all due respect to my colleague from Montana, these are not some kind of ad hominem attacks. These are facts.

Last year, she said: Hey, I agree with my husband's article. Let it burn. Let the homes burn in these wildfires.

That is not going to work in my State. She is going to head up an Agency with enormous power over my State and its future.

So, look, we have differences on issues of resource development, energy for America, certainly on issues of jobs. In my State, unfortunately, the Biden administration seems to, weekly, want to shut down resources just in Alaska. I think we are up to almost 20 Executive orders or related actions from this administration focused just on my State—to shut down jobs.

I gave a speech here a while ago asking, not the President of the Senate, the President of the United States: Can you imagine if a Republican administration came in and issued almost, who knows, 10, 15—it is hard to count—Executive orders shutting down Delaware's economy? What would you do, Mr. President, if you were a Senator? You would be furious.

Well, I am furious, and I am furious because we have got another radical who is going to be in charge of my State's future.

"Let it burn." Tree spikes.

But here we are, unfortunately, about to confirm this individual as the Director of BLM. But here's the thing I want to know. If you are a western Senator—say, Arizona, Nevada, California—good luck going home and explaining this to your constituents. Good luck with that.

I am going to just mention another nominee to speak about briefly. If Tracy Stone-Manning weren't radical enough, I would like to mention another Biden nominee from the far-left socialist fringe. This is Saule Omarova, who was nominated by the President to be Comptroller of the Currency.

So what does the Comptroller of Currency do?

It charts and regulates and supervises all national banks—another very serious position. Not a lot of Americans, you know, highlight this or think about it a lot. It is like BLM, but it is important and powerful. And you would think you would have somebody in that position who would understand

or value and respect free markets in our financial system, particularly our banks.

Ms. Omarova doesn't value our system and doesn't seem to much like banks. She has other ideas. According to the Wall Street Journal today, they said that it might even make our colleague Senator SANDERS blush.

So who is Ms. Omarova?

First, she is a 1989 graduate in Moscow State University, where she received the Lenin Personal Academic Scholarship. Yeah, you heard me right. I am not talking Moscow, ID. I am talking the real Moscow in the Soviet Union. Let me say that again. A graduate of Moscow State University, where she received the Lenin Personal Academic Scholarship. You can't make this stuff up.

From her writings, it appears that she still significantly believes in what she learned at old Moscow U, particularly about our free market system and communism and socialism.

Here is what she tweeted in 2019—2019, 3 years ago—2 years ago: Until I came to the U.S., I couldn't imagine things like gender pay gap still existed in today's world. Say what you want about the old USSR, there was no gender pay gap there. Markets don't always know best.

That is a tweet 2 years ago: Say what you want about the old USSR, about Stalin and Lenin and the roughly 100 million people killed during their reigns. Say what you want about the old USSR, the famine, human degradation, about the ill-fated violent attempts to snuff out the flame of freedom and liberty all across the world. Say what you want about the old USSR, the gulags, pogroms. At least there is no gender gap. There is no food either, by the way; and there is no freedom.

So she is like: Hum, maybe I should clarify this.

So here is her clarification: I never claimed men and women were treated absolutely equal in every facet of the old Soviet Union, but people's salaries were set by the State in a gender-blind manner, and all women got very generous benefits, but those things are still a pipe dream in our American society.

Wow. That was her clarification. Oh, the golden days of the USSR, a mere pipe dream now. Her nostalgia for socialist communist regimes and policies doesn't end with pay disparities. She has advocated for expanding the Federal Reserve's mandate to include draconian controls over financial institutions, wages, and consumer bank deposits.

How would she do this?

Through "a people's ledger, a national investment authority, a public interest council."

Sounds like a modern-day version of the system set up by the Bolsheviks that I am sure she learned about at Moscow U. Plainly put, she is another radical who will have sweeping powers

over the institutions of our United States Government.

So I am going to conclude with this: If you are watching America, I hope you are seeing a theme here. The Biden administration, unfortunately with the help of some of my Senate Democratic colleagues, is trying to make us comfortable with far-left fringe radical appointments who will take over very significant posts in our government and will push us towards the path of socialism. They are pushing a radical left lurch for our country that the vast majority of Americans don't want.

Just look at what my colleagues are coming up with, with their \$3½ trillion tax-and-spend bill written by the chairman of the Budget Committee, an avowed socialist. It is not an insult. That is a fact.

All this is being done with no hearings, no markups; the biggest social spending bill in decades with zero transparency. Even the House had a markup. But the Senate, once known as the most deliberative body in the world, is not having one hearing or one markup on a \$3½ trillion reckless tax-and-spend bill.

But mainstream middle-class America does not want socialism, and they don't want far-left radicals to run our Federal Government. My Democratic colleagues keep thinking they can ram through this far-left agenda without anyone noticing, but the American people are noticing. The American people are wise, and they are already starting to feel the pain of the Biden administration's far-left, anti-energy, anti-capitalism agenda, especially at the pump.

They will remember which Senators are enabling this, and they will remember the Senators who have no problem voting for nominees who have a record of being part of organizations that sought to perpetrate violence against their fellow Americans.

I hope my Democratic colleagues have a change of heart and vote against Tracy Stone-[Spike]-Manning because our country and my State really don't need her in charge.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, there has been a lot of impassioned words about a nominee that we will have before us in just a matter of less than an hour, Tracy Stone-Manning. Know that I join my colleagues in the concerns that they have expressed, as we look to those individuals that we asked to take the helm of some of these very important Agencies—Agencies, as my colleague from Alaska has pointed out—that have extraordinary impact on the activities and the actions that go on in our State. We need to have only the highest caliber of men and women. And in what we have seen, the background that we have seen with this particular nominee, I would hope, would shock us all.

And so as we move forward with this nomination process and consider the

impact to, again, not just an Agency, not just to a department, but the impact that then comes to our communities, our States, the people who we work for, it is only appropriate and fitting that we speak to the issues that we have learned of; we speak to the truth of the matter; and the truth of the matter is that this nominee is not an individual who should be in this position.

NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

Mr. President, I did not come to the floor today to speak to this nomination. I have done it previously. I will be voting against her nomination in just a moment, but I came to the floor today because this is a day of special recognition, September 30. And I am joining colleagues and many people across our country and in Canada, who are coming together on what we are calling a National Day of Remembrance, to give voice to the thousands of Native children who tragically died in Indian boarding schools across America and in Canada and to acknowledge and support the thousands of Native children who survived but are perhaps still coping with intergenerational trauma from these experiences.

Today, we recognize and honor the lives lost of thousands of innocent Native children who died and remain lost to their communities and families in misattributed or unmarked graves across America and in Canada. We remember not only the children that were lost but not forgotten, but also the families, again, that are still impacted by this tragedy.

Supporters like myself are wearing orange today because of the story of one First Nation's boarding school survivor, Phyllis Webstad. Phyllis helped to elevate this issue by recounting her own boarding school experience in Canada. She was just 6 years old—6 years old. She was living with her grandmother when she was taken away to a residential Mission school.

You know, you think about what that means, to know that the child that is entrusted to you as the grandparent, that her education, the only education that she will be able to receive, will be away from the family, away from you at 6 years of age.

Her family didn't have a lot of money, but somehow, her grandmother managed to buy a new outfit for her to wear on the first day of school, and that outfit included a new shiny orange shirt that Phyllis had picked out for this occasion. And when that little girl arrived at school, excited for her first day, she was shocked to be stripped of her clothes and her new orange shirt and forced to wear a standard uniform. And it was that moment in time that would leave an indelible mark on a young girl that would later start a movement across nations to remind us how innocent Native children were truly stripped of their identities and made to feel as if they didn't matter—they just didn't matter.

The stories of those children who were taken from their families and

sent away to these boarding schools need to be shared, and they need to be heard. And we collectively, as a country, need to support indigenous survivors in their healing journey.

Our Nation's history in the treatment of Native American people is not an easy one to tell. It is not easy to hear or to acknowledge, but our discomfort in sharing painful, collective history probably pales in comparison to the lived experience and the realities that so many Native people continue to face today.

For a long period of time, beginning with the enactment of the Civilization Act of March 3, 1819, there were thousands of Native American children who were taken from their families and taken from their communities, often forcibly removed. They were relocated to residential boarding schools. Some of the schools were perhaps closer to their home and some of those schools not so close to home and not so close to their families.

The Federal Government made attendance compulsory for all indigenous children. Some of the children were as young as just 3 or 4 years old. I find that just incomprehensible, really, that a toddler—a toddler—could be removed from their home and their parents.

While Indian boarding schools were in operation, many enrolled children were forced into manual labor. Some worked maintaining the schools that they were in, and a number of schools lent the children to nearby communities or surrounding States to work, and they worked as domestic servants. They may have worked as farm laborers and at factories.

While attending Indian boarding school, so many—so many—children were stripped of their Native identities and their culture. We have heard the stories. They were forbidden to speak in their traditional language. They were forbidden to practice their religious or their spiritual beliefs. They were forbidden to dress in traditional clothes, to wear their hair long or in braids. Native identity was replaced with a new identity that was viewed as being more acceptable to American society at that time. And by cutting a child's long hair, speaking to them only in English, dressing them in uniforms, shedding all parts of their indigenous cultures, our Federal Government really stole from these children their identities, who they are.

The stories are told—they are legendary in many places—stories told about when a child disobeyed the rules, they were often physically, verbally, mentally abused, sometimes placed in solitary confinement like a prisoner. It has been commonly reported that numerous Native children who attended the Indian boarding schools were abused both physically and sexually. Many children died while at the schools.

This is what remains unknown. We know that they died from exposure to